

A sober Expoſtulation with the Gentlemen
and Citizens of Mr. *Emlin's* Juries in
DUBLIN, concerning their *Billa Vera*
and Verdict, June 14, 1703.

THEY are deſervedly reckon'd among the great Privileges of *English-men*, and ſuch wherein their Freedom does mainly conſiſt, viz.
1^{ſt}. That they are ſubject to no Laws, but what are enacted by their own Conſent, by Representatives of their own choice in Parliament: And 2^{dly}, That the Execution of thoſe Laws is for the moſt part by ſworn Men of the Neighbourhood. That is, a Man can't be brought into Judgment, or judicially charg'd with any Crime which makes him liable to Punishment, but firſt a Grand Jury of twenty three, or at leaſt twelve of thoſe ſubſtantial Men, muſt upon their Oaths certify, that upon their own Knowledge, or the Evidence of other legal Witneſſes, he appears to them to be guilty of ſuch or ſuch a Crime. Hereupon he is call'd to anſwer for himſelf before another Jury of twelve good and honeſt Men of his Neighbourhood, who are oblig'd by ſolemn Oath, and all other Ties of Humanity and Intereſt, to judg him as themſelves would be judg'd. The Judges are of Council for the King or Queen and the Priſoner, to ſee that nothing be made a Crime, which is not indeed a Crime according to Law; and the Jury are Judges whether the Perſon indicted be guilty of the Fact which the Law pronounces a

Crime. It's not enough in many caſes to make one guilty, that he has done ſuch a Fact or Deed, but it muſt alſo be prov'd that he did do that Fact in ſuch a manner, and with ſuch Circumſtances as the Law pronounces criminal. Therefore the Indictments mention thoſe Circumſtances and that Manner: as for example, a Man is indicted, that having not the Fear of God before his Eyes, he did feloniously, and of fore-thought Malice, give a Man ſuch and ſuch Wounds, whereby he took away his Life; if it be prov'd to the Jury that the indicted Perſon did give ſuch and ſuch Wounds, yet if it be not alſo prov'd that he did ſo of fore-thought Malice, the Jury can't find him guilty of the Murder charg'd upon him. So if it be prov'd that a Man ſpoke ſuch and ſuch Words, that might in ſome Conſtructions tend to the Reproach or Scandal of another Perſon; yet if it be not prov'd that he ſpoke thoſe Words with an intent to reproach and ſcandalize that Perſon, he ſhall not be found guilty. For it may be that he did underſtand thoſe Words in a good ſenſe, that has no Scandal or Reproach in it, in his Mind and Judgment: As if a Man ſhould ſay, that *St. Paul* was a *Knave of J.C.* underſtanding that Word (*Knave*) as *Tyndal* does in his Tranſlation, and not in the modern ſenſe of that Word. When the Lord *Shaftsbury*

sued the Lord Digby for maliciously speaking such and such Words, he prov'd the Malice as well as the Words.

These things premis'd, give me leave, you Gentlemen of both the Juries, to expostulate with you concerning the finding the Bill of Blasphemy and Malice against *Tho. Emlyn* Gent. and your Verdicts thereupon; for which the Judges pass'd a Sentence of 1000*l.* Fine, and Imprisonment for a year and a day, and then to give Security for his good Behaviour during Life.

The Indictment upon which you judg'd him guilty runs thus (as I am inform'd) when turn'd into *English*: That *T. E.* not having the Fear of God before his Eyes, ——— did write and cause to be printed a certain infamous and scandalous Libel, intituled, *An humble Enquiry* ——— in which Libel the said *T. E.* hath impiously, blasphemously, falsely, and maliciously asserted, affirmed, and declared, that Jesus Christ our Saviour and Redeemer is not God the Son, nor is equal to God the Father, and that Jesus Christ is not God the Son in the supreme Essence with the Father, (meaning) God the Father.

Now you Gentlemen being of the Neighbourhood or Vicinage, are suppos'd to know *Mr. E.*'s Character, his manner of Life and Conversation; he having liv'd among you twelve years in a publick Station of Elder, Presbyter, or at least Preacher to a Congregation of Presbyterians in *Dublin*. Did you know, or had you heard of him, that he had not behav'd himself as became him, either in his publick Performances or private Conversation? Was he not accounted by those that knew him best, a pious Man himself, and a Promoter of Piety in others? Did he not study the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of his Faith and Manners, as all Protestants hold; and diligently exhort others to do the same? Did he not study to find the true sense of Scripture (which only is Scripture) and to teach it to others? In brief, did he give any occasion to the most critical Observer

of him, to judg him a Hypocrite, a Dissembler, or ill-minded Man? Has he not by his ingenuous Declaration of his Mind in private Conversation, and afterward in his Writings (supposing 'em his) expos'd himself to all that Trouble, Obloquy, and Suffering which he now lies under? Might he not have avoided these, and continued in Credit, and in that profitable Station wherein he was, had he not thought himself oblig'd in Conscience to promote those Doctrines, which he conceiv'd to be much for the Honour of God and Christ, and more suitable to Holy Scripture than what is commonly taught? And if *Mr. E.* did not give you, or any one, just cause of suspecting him to be a bad Man, how came ye to judg him one of the worst of Men?

To be a Drunkard, a common Swearer, a Whoremonger, to be unjust, to deceive Men for their hurt and one's own gain, to be a false Witness, to be an Extortioner and to oppress; these are but Peccadillo's, small Faults in comparison of blaspheming God Almighty, the Fountain of all Goodness, the Father of Mercies, in whom we live and move and have our Being, who so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life: or to blaspheme Jesus Christ our Lord, who came to save us from our Sins, and redeem us to God, in whom we have Redemption thro his Blood, even the Forgiveness of Sins: to blaspheme either the Father or the Son, and to have malice against them, are so heinous and enormous Crimes, that we want Words to set forth the Horridness and Malignity of them. Yet you have upon your Oaths (which is the strongest and utmost Obligation that any Man can be under, to give a righteous Judgment concerning his Neighbour) judg'd *Mr. E.* to have impiously, blasphemously, falsely, and maliciously asserted, affirmed, and declared Jesus Christ our Saviour and Redeemer, *not to be God the Son, nor to be equal*

equal to God the Father ; and that Jesus Christ is not God the Son in the Supreme Essence with the Father, (meaning) God the Father.

To justify your Verdict upon this Indictment, it was necessary you should know, and be thoroughly persuaded in the fear of God, 1. That these Assertions and Affirmations are not only false, but impious ; and not only false and impious, but also blasphemous and malicious in their own Nature and Import, i. e. in the common Acceptation of *English* Christians. 2. That Mr. E. did so assert and affirm them. It's not enough to prove these Propositions to be false, because they may be false, and yet not impious ; for there are many different Opinions about these Points among the learned Divines of the Church as well as Dissenters ; and yet it were uncharitable to judg those that are mistaken to be guilty of Impiety : and it's manifest from the Clemency of the Government, that it does not censure them as such, that some may judg to be erroneous. The Bishops disagree among themselves, as appears from their Writings, and yet they are not accus'd of Impiety on either side ; nor are the Deans, and other Dignitaries and Doctors, charg'd with Impiety, tho they differ from their Bishops, and from one another. Some indeed have declar'd certain Propositions false, impious, and heretical, as the *Oxford* Decree doth some in one Mr. Bingham's Sermon, which are also to be met with in Dr. Sherlock's Book ; but they did not charge either the former or the latter with having falsly, impiously, and heretically taught, preach'd, or print-ed those false, impious, and heretical Doctrines. They did not cause either of them to be apprehended by a Warrant from the Lord Chief Justice, and bind them over to answer that Charge at the *Kings-Bench* Bar ; much less prefer an Indictment of Impiety and Heresy or Blasphemy against 'em, or either of 'em. So far from that, Mr. Bingham went into the Country to a good Living (if I

mistake not) however I'm sure Dr. Sherlock enjoys to this day his Deanery of St. Paul's, one of the best, or the best in England for Revenue, if not also for Dignity. Nay, Dr. Sherlock was so far from renouncing those false, impious, and heretical Propositions, that he presently writes a Book in defence of them, under the Title of *A modest Examination of the Authority and Reasons of the late Decree of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, &c.* And what were those impious Assertions ? even these, viz. [There are three infinite distinct Minds and Substances in the Trinity] Item [That the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits, and three individual Substances.] 'Tis in respect to these Propositions, that Dr. South wrote a Book against Dr. Sherlock with this Title, *Tritheism charg'd upon Dr. Sherlock's Notion of the Holy Trinity.* And one would think, that to hold and assert that there are three Gods, is not a little impious and heretical ; since Unity is the prime Attribute and Perfection of the Deity, most plainly asserted by Reason and Scripture, and profess'd as the most fundamental Article, after the Being of God, of Christian Religion, yea of the *Jewish* and *Mahometan*.

Thus, Gentlemen, you see there is a great deal of difference between asserting those Doctrines that are judg'd by many learned Men to be impious and heretical ; and the asserting them impiously and heretically. For as our Blessed Saviour says, My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me ; If any Man will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine : If a Man be a known Doer of the Will of God, and a Studier of the Holy Scriptures, that he may know that Will, and do it himself, and teach others so ; if such a Person err in the understanding of the Holy Scriptures in matters of very abstruse Speculation, one can't without great Uncharitableness judg that he holds these false Doctrines impiously, heretically, blasphemously and maliciously.

But let us now consider those Assertions of Mr. E. charg'd in the Indictment, and judg'd by you to be false, impious, blasphemous, and malicious. As 1st, 'I see no reason there will be to oppose those Unitarians who think him (Jesus Christ) to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, tho he be not the only Supreme God; nor can any with Reason attempt to prove him to be such from his Works and Office, as King of his Church; since 'tis implied that as such he must do homage to God the Father, in *delivering up his Kingdom to him*; and this very Expression to God the Father, makes it plain that there is no God the Son, in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father. Now to give a right Judgment concerning the Truth or Falshood of this Clause, it was necessary for you to consider it as an Inference from such and such Scripture Premises, from whence it is drawn. For if it be rightly infer'd, it must be true; if it is not rightly infer'd, then Mr. E. err'd. If so, then it was to be consider'd by you, what kind of Error it was; whether such an Error as a sober conscientious Man (who holds the Holy Scripture to be the Rule of his Faith and Practice) could fall into without Malice, and a blasphemous Intention against Jesus Christ; or if it be Mr. E's simple mistake from the Weakness of human Understanding, or other Temptations, to which the best of Men are obnoxious. If this latter was the case, then to judg him blasphemous, was most unjust and uncharitable; and whether you had or could have any clear Evidence for it, I appeal to your own Consciences. But 2^{dly}, may not Mr. E. be understood to mean that *there is no God the Son in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father*? that is, that he is not the second of those three infinite Minds or Spirits, that make up the three Persons in the Holy Trinity; which Doctrine the Oxford Decree has determin'd to be false, impious, and heretical. Shall he be blasphemous in denying that which they

say is impious to affirm?

That which I have said of this Clause of the Indictment, may also be said of those other two Clauses; which are both Inferences from Scripture Premises, which he had laid down and argued before. And indeed it's so far from being blasphemous to Jesus Christ, to deny him to be equal to the Father in the Supreme Essence, that the generality of eminent Divines, both antient and modern, assert that the Father is the *Principle, Cause, and Fountain* of the Son and Spirit, whence they have their Essence and Divinity; and in that respect grant that the Son and Holy Spirit are not equal to the Father. But let that nicest of Controversies be as it will, I do not desire you should take any thing upon my word; that which I demand of you is, whether you could in *Truth, in Judgment, and in Righteousness*, swear that these Assertions, whercof Mr. E. was by you found guilty, were blasphemous, i.e. reproachful and disgraceful to our Lord Jesus Christ. As for the term *maliciously* (us'd in the Indictment) I am apt to think so well of you, tho altogether unknown to me, that I am persuaded, that not one Man of you, (even supposing those Clauses to be false and blasphemous) can seriously affirm, much less swear, that Mr. E. writ or publish'd them blasphemously, i.e. with an intention of reproaching his Saviour, or at least believing they were reproachful to him, much less maliciously and out of ill will toward him: That he not only knew that these Assertions were reproachful, but that he knew also that he did reproach him in so asserting; as a Man speaks evil of his Neighbour, tho he know it is false, and that he ought not to speak it. I doubt not but you are every one well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures; and there you find that Blasphemy under the *Mosaical Law* was so great and horrid a Crime, that it was to be punish'd with Death: but what was that Blasphemy? It's explain'd by cursing; *The Israelitish Woman's Son blasphemed the Name.*

Name of the Lord, and cursed: he not only spoke reproachfully of God, and intended to reproach or speak evil of him, but cursed him, as you may see *Lev. 24. 11, 14, 15.* But the Apostle *Paul* before his Conversion not only blasphemed Christ himself, but forced others to blaspheme him; forcing them by Violence to speak evil of Christ, to renounce him, and curse him as a false Prophet or Impostor. *Saul* knew it was evil and highly evil, what he said himself of Christ, and what he would force others to say; but he was mistaken in the Honour and Dignity of Christ, and he did it ignorantly in Unbelief. But what has *Mr. E.* done or said like to this? you ought to have read the Papers out of which that Blasphemy, charg'd in the Indictment, was drawn. I have read *Mr. E's* Case, &c. and there he says, *he conceiv'd it more for the Honour of Jesus Christ to suppose the compleat Deity in its full Conception, to be united to, to dwell and operate in him, than to suppose it only of a Portion of God, or of God but partially consider'd.* He produces two or three Texts of Scripture on which he grounds this Conception, as *Col. 2. 9. In him dwells all the Fulness of the Godhead or Deity: and John 14. 10. The Father that dwells in me, he doth the Works.* *Acts 10. 38.* So that *Mr. E.* is so far from intending to speak evil of Christ, that what he says, he grounds conscientiously upon what Christ says of himself, and what the Apostle *Paul* says of him, and with a design to honour him.

Now, Gentlemen, if *Mr. E.* was so far from intending any Dishonour to our Saviour Jesus Christ in what he wrote, that he thought it more honourable to him than the contrary, and intended it to that purpose; what Evidence could you possibly have that he wrote those things blasphemously? and if you had no Evidence of it, and notwithstanding will assert it upon your Oaths, and thereby expose *Mr. E.* to a Sentence that fines him more a great deal, perhaps twice as much as he is ever able to pay, and consequently

to a long and perpetual Imprisonment, or an early Death by that Imprisonment; how will you answer it to your own Consciences all the time of your Life, much more at the time when you shall appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ to receive the Reward of this Judgment?

Let me now ask you what Evidence you had of *Mr. E's* writing, or causing that Libel to be printed, and publishing it? I observe (tho I know not whether you did) the Indictment says, *wrote and caus'd to be printed*: It was not enough that you had Evidence that he caus'd it to be printed, and publish'd it, but you should have had it prov'd that he wrote it. My Information says, that all that was prov'd was, that he publish'd it, and that his writing it was found by you upon Presumption, which you were told from the Bench, *might be as good Evidence as positive Proof.* But who does not know that the strongest Presumptions have been afterwards found to be false Evidence? It's a sad but a well-known Story of a Mother and her two Sons in *Glocestershire*, who some years since were found guilty of murdering a Man upon presumptive Evidence, and the Sons were hang'd in Chains; but afterwards, to the astonishment of the Jury-men, the murder'd Man came home. I was acquainted with one of those Jury-men, an honest and pious Man, but led, it seems, into this great Error by the Judge's magnifying presumptive Evidence: the poor Man in doleful Despair could not endure his own Country, but came to *London*, and liv'd in Obscurity. Now how you could discharge your selves of your Oath upon a mere Presumption, which ought always to be taken in favour of the Prisoner, I know not. I presume as well as you that he did write it, but I will not upon single Presumption give it upon my Oath.

But supposing that which however is not prov'd, what Law has *Mr. E.* broken? He does heartily and most sincerely believe whatsoever is written in the H. Scripture concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ, and he believes it in the best sense he can understand.

understand it in consistency with it self. Now the sixth Article of the Church of England says, *That nothing ought to be required of any Man as necessary to be believed*——but what is read in Scripture, or may be prov'd thereby: And he asserts nothing in his Book that he does not heartily believe is either expressly written in Holy Scripture, or which after many years Study of the same Scripture with all such Helps (as Prayers to God thro Christ, &c.) he is capable of, he believes to be the true Sense of those Scriptures. Now what Law has he herein transgress'd? What Statute or Common Law makes this Blasphemy? He does not deny (as appears by his Case) those three modal Distinctions by which Divines do usually explain the Trinity, viz. Life, Understanding, and Will; nor St. Austin's Trinity of Mind, Wisdom, and Love. Mr. E. acknowledges also the Union of the Divine and Human Nature in

Vid. Mr. E's these Words, viz. *The infinite God is in an unspeakable manner united to and present with the Man Christ Jesus, dwelling and operating in him, actuating and managing him by a fix'd perpetual Influence, as the governing Principle.* Where again is that Law that makes it Blasphemy for any Man to infer from plain Scriptures, that there is a God above Christ, or who is Christ's Head and his God; *That Christ is not the absolutely Supreme God; or that there is no God the Son in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father?* I do not determine whether to infer so is erroneous or not: but where is it forbid as Blasphemy, and made liable to such a Sentence as is pass'd upon Mr. E? So likewise to infer from Christ's saying, *My Father is greater than I;* and from his delivering up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; and the Son also himself being subject to him that put all things under him: to infer, I say, from these and other Texts, *That Jesus Christ in his highest Capacity is inferior to the Father, and not the same God to which he is subject;* Where is

that Law that forbids that Inference under the penalty of Blasphemy? If there be no such Law, neither in our Statute Books, nor Common Law (as many of our Learned in the Law say) then this Judgment against Mr. E. is of dismal consequence, as a Precedent wherein the Judges and the Court do in a sort make that to be Law, which is not Law, and the different Senses of learned Men in the expounding of Scripture to be Blasphemy, when that Sense does not agree with their Mind, or with the Opinion of the Vulgar or the many that cry out against it. I say, the Precedent is of dismal consequence; for so no learned Man that asserts any Sense of Scripture different from the Sense of other learned Men, who are apt enough to give it the name of *Impious, Heretical, and Blasphemous*, but if the contrary Party can get a Lord Chief Justice and his Assessors on his side, he may ruin his Antagonist: for it's not hard, it seems, to get a Jury to bring him in *Guilty*, yea tho there be but presumptive Evidence. Are we come to this in the Reign of our most gracious and religious Queen, that the Judges shall make that to be Law, which the Subjects can't know to be such, and inflict what Penalties they please upon learned Men for writing Controversies, and deprive 'em of their Liberty, and confine them during their whole Life? For this is the Precedent they have set us. Dr. Sherlock the Reverend Dean of Paul's, and Mr. Bingham may hence see that their Liberties and Estates too would have been in hazard, had our Judges been of the same mind with Dr. South and the Oxford Heads; that Doctor and Mr. Bingham had been indicted for falsely, impiously, and heretically (it had been as easy to have added *blasphemously* and *maliciously*) writing, causing to be printed, and publishing a certain great Book, wherein they asserted, *That the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits, and three individual Substances.* There might have been found Jury-men enough at Oxford to have found them *Guilty*. This would have

have been a short way with the Dean to have depriv'd him of his Deanery and all other Benefices, and to have condemn'd both him and Mr. B. to perpetual Imprisonment, by laying upon 'em a Fine of about as much again as they are worth. Let any Man that can, shew me the difference of these two Cases.

And I hope I shall not offend my Lord Bishop of Sarum, if I say his Notion of the Divine Inhabitation seems to be very like to, if not the same with Mr. Emlyn's; for my Lord is charg'd by the Oxford Divines in an Examination of his Exposition, &c. that such an Inhabitation of God in a Creature, by which that Creature was not only call'd God, but that Adoration was due to it upon that account, was a Notion that could not have scandaliz'd the Jews, &c. From this, I say, and some other Expressions of my Lord's, he is charg'd with these Opinions as necessarily flowing from them; 1. That the Name of God may be justly ascribed to a Creature. 2. That a Creature may be the lawful Object of religious Adoration. 3. That

The Exposit. a local Presence and In-
of the 2d Art. dwelling of the Godhead in
examin'd, p. 3. Christ, without a proper
and essential Union, was
sufficient to entitle the Man Christ Jesus to
the Name and Worship of God. Now sup-
posing a Lord Chief Justice or other
Judges of the same mind with the Oxford
Divines, and my Lord had been indicted
in form, for falsely, impiously, and blas-
phemously writing, printing, and publish-
ing these Assertions; do you think, Gen-
tlemen, that a Grand and a Petty Jury
might not be found at Oxford, the one to
write *Billa Vera* upon it, and the other to
bring in a Verdict of my Lord Bishop of
Sarum's being guilty, &c? And I fear
that if my Lord Bishop of Gloucester were
to have his Trial before such Judges and
such a Jury as you, his Assertions in his
twenty eight Propositions, which clearly
agree with those that Mr. E. is con-
demn'd for, his Lordship would fall
under the very same Sentence: nay if

only Edward Gloucester be put in the Indict-
ment instead of Tho. Emlyn, his Lordship
is condemn'd already. For if Mr. E. is
condemn'd for saying that if Christ has a
God above him, then is he not the absolutely
Supreme God; his Lordship has said that
which is equivalent. 'Pr. 1. The Name
'of God is us'd in more Senses than one
'in Holy Scripture. Pr. 4. God the Fa-
'ther alone is in reference to his manner
'of Existence an absolutely perfect Be-
'ing; because he alone is self-existent.
'Pr. 5. He alone, consequently, is ab-
'solutely perfect, in reference to those
'Perfections, which do presuppose Self-
'Existence. Pr. 6. These Perfections are
'absolute Independance, and being the
'first Original of all other Beings; in
'which the Son and Holy Ghost are com-
'prehended. Pr. 10. Since the Father
'alone is a Being of the most absolute
'Perfection, he having those Perfections
'which the other two are incapable of
'having; He alone is God in the absolute
'highest Sense. What is this less than
Mr. E's saying, that Christ is not the ab-
solute Supreme God? Hence it's very ma-
nifest, his Lordship's Liberty, Dignity,
Estate, and Freedom from perpetual Im-
prisonment, depend not on the Laws, but
upon his good Fortune, in not meeting
with Prosecutors, and zealous Judges of
a contrary mind, together with some ig-
norant or over-credulous Juries, who are
easy to be found. And I know not what
you Gentlemen and your Court would
have done with Dr. Bull, who in his
Defensio Fidei Nicenæ, has a long Section
De subordinatione Filii ad Patrem; but it's
somewhat hard to understand how God
the Son should be subordinate to God the
Father, and yet equal in the Supreme Ef-
fence: yet to him, and to the late most
Learned Dr. Cudworth, the Bishop of Gloucester refers us for the account of the Agree-
ment of several of the Nicene Fathers,
even Athanasius himself, and others of the
Antients, to what he had propos'd, Pr. 28.

I could name several other Learned
Men, who are by their Writings liable

to Mr. *Emlyn's* Judgment and Condemnation; but I think I have given Instances enough to make all Men of free minds look about 'em, and ingage both in Justice and Interest to be zealous for the revoking of his Judgment.

I cannot much blame you, Gentlemen, for giving credit to the Judges that these Clauses were criminal and blasphemous at Common Law, because the Judges are appointed, and it is their Duty to assist the Jury in the point of Law, especially the Common Law, which is not easy to be found out: but I can't but blame you, that in a point of Religion you should not examine the Book it self, and like the *Be-reans* search the Scriptures, to see and judg whether what Mr. *E.* was charg'd with was true and agreeing with Scripture or not, and accordingly to have judg'd or suspended your Judgment, and brought in a special Verdict. But that you should without such Examination determine concerning the Falsity of it, and not only that, but of its Contrariety to Law, and that upon a partial proof: and that you should not only judg it upon your Oaths to be false and contrary to Law, but also impious, blasphemous, and malicious; and not only so, but that Mr. *E.* your Neighbour, of whom you never heard any ill thing, as I persuade my self, but a great deal of good, should be judg'd by you to have written and publish'd this Book, with those Clauses, impiously, blasphemously, and maliciously: I will say no more, but sit down and admire that such *English* Juries should be found, and pray God to give you Repentance that you may be forgiven. But where there

wants Confession and Restitution in case of Injury to Men, there is no Forgiveness from God. Therefore I see not, but that in order to Forgiveness, you ought to consult and agree together to go to the Judges, and others that are concern'd in the Execution of the Sentence grounded upon your Verdict, confessing that it was given upon Inconsideration, Ignorance, and Rashness; and that you were carried away by the Clamour of the People, and your too much deference to the Judges, to give a false Judgment: that you revoke it, and beseech them to revoke their Sentence and Condemnation built thereupon. How you can any other way be capable of Remission either from the just God injur'd Men, I beseech you to consider. I say injur'd Men, for in your Verdict (so call'd) against Mr. *Emlyn*, you have (as I have said) made a Precedent for the Prosecution and Ruin of most of the Learned Men in the two Kingdoms; who hereafter may be fin'd, sentenc'd, and imprison'd by the Assistance of such a Jury as you were.

Here I might aggravate the Grievousness of your Verdict, from the sad Tendency of it to the Vindication of the Persecutions by the *Roman* Church of those that dissented from her, upon the ground of conscientious Expositions of Scripture, as all the Reformers did, and do still; and withal to the Condemnation of the Reformers, and casting the Guilt upon their own Heads: But I leave what I have said to your serious Consideration, hoping you will (like Men of Integrity) review what you have done, and either approve it or repent of it.



F I N I S.

